

client computer or a demand client computer being searched within said search area parameter.

24. (New) A computer assisted method of claim 1 wherein at least one of said
5 supply or demand client can contact a matched supply client or demand client by activating an available contact means on a computer screen.

25. (New) A computer assisted method of claim 24 wherein said activating an available contact means is done by selecting an icon on said computer screen.

26. (New) A computer assisted method of claim 1 wherein said contact means is
10 made anonymous.

27. (New) A computer assisted method of claim 1 wherein:
said geographical position of said client computer or said demand client computer is determined from a multiplicity of GPS satellites; and
said demand-side and said-supply side geographic location information, with
15 parameters and possible additional information, are delivered to and distributed from said host server by a two-way satellite link.

REMARKS

The present amendment supplements the amendment filed by first-class mail on
20 May 16, 2005, by further amending Claim 1 and adding new Claims 22-27. A Credit Card Payment Form is being submitted to pay for \$150.00 for an additional six dependent claims for a small entity.

In the Office Action dated November 15, 2004, the examiner rejected Claim 1 and dependent Claims 5, 18-20 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by USP 6,249,282 to
25 Sutcliffe. Applicant's response filed on May 16, 2005 showed how Claim 1 as amended in that response patentably distinguished over Sutcliffe. Currently amended Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sutcliffe in the same material respects as did the version of Claim 1 submitted in Applicant's May 16, 2005 response.

In particular, current Claim 1 recites:
30 at least one of said demand-side geographic location information and said supply-side geographic information being updated automatically on said host server in real time from a geographic location information system.

Current Claim 1 also recites that the recited contact means is “current.” The foregoing recitations in current Claim 1 distinguish over Sutcliffe are materially the same as the corresponding recitations from Claim 1 as presented in the May 16, 2005 response in respect of distinguishing over Sutcliffe.

Prior Art lacking two-sided intelligence

The currently amended Claim 1 additionally recites the concept of “Mobile demand and Supply,” so as to be even clearer to point out that two intelligent mobile parties are trading between themselves.

In Chou’s invention, US 6,327,533 only one intelligent party is searching, i.e., a party searching for a “dummy” vehicle.

One similar, undated application is commercialized by a Finnish mobile phone maker Benefon Oyj. In this application a hunting dog is given a GPS receiver utilizing cellular phone network in order to be connected with hunter. Dog’s real-time geological position is shown on a map of the hunter’s cell phone so the hunter can follow the dog. As such, the foregoing cellular phone application is similar the US 6,327,533 to Chou, in which a “dummy” vehicle can be tracked.

In contrast, if allegorized, the invention of Claim 1 would allow a dog—if it were possible to endow the dog with human capabilities—to be given a chance to have a break and not to be shown on hunters’ handset, or if he wants, to profile himself to be an unleashed, vacationing dog looking for a female dog, actively searching for female dog by using his handset, which would be much more fun than running after a moose.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowed.

Applicant’s further comments in the response filed on May 16, 2005, distinguishing then-Claim 1 from references applied against Dependent Claims 2-20, apply as well to present Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 should be held patentable over the prior art.

New Dependent Claims 22-27

New Claims 22-27 depend at least ultimately from Claim 1 that patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and so also patentably distinguish over the prior art. Dependent Claims 22-27 recite further features of the invention so as to even more forcefully distinguish over the prior art than Claim 1.